

## **REMARKS**

Claims 54 and 61 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claim 71 has been amended. For instance, support for the amendment appears e.g. in the original claims of the application.

Claims 1, 22 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph on grounds that the “the claims still read on comprising before the canceled subject matter ....” The rejection is traversed.

The rejection is traversed. Claim language following “comprising” was not rejected. The claims are set forth above. Respectfully, it appears that some confusion existed as to what language was striken as deleted, and what language was underlined as added in Applicants’ prior response.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claim 5 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) on grounds that “[c]laim 5 refers to the first resin of claim 1, however, claim 1 does not have a first resin.”

As discussed above, claim 1 does recite a “first resin”. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 22, 24, 52 and 62-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Khojasteh et al. (US Patent Publication 2002/0058204) in view of Brock et al. (US Patent 644408). The rejection is traversed.

The cited documents, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach Applicants' claimed invention.

In particular, each of the pending claims calls for an underlayer composition that comprises two distinct resins, i.e. (i) a first resin that comprises aromatic and/or alicyclic groups and (ii) a second resin that is distinct from the first resin and comprises one or more chromophore groups.

This is a preferred aspect of Applicants' invention as discussed at page 4, lines 27-30 as follows:

Particularly preferred underlayer compositions of the invention comprise a first resin that comprises etch-resistant moieties and a second resin (distinct i.e. non-covalently linked with respect to the first resin) that comprises chromophore moieties, i.e., the underlayer comprises a blend of distinct resins.

In clear contrast, the compositions of the cited primary document of Khojasteh et al. contain a *single* resin. Nowhere does Khojasteh et al. report a composition having multiple distinct resins as Applicants claims, or the benefits provided thereby.

The secondary citation of Brock et al. does not remedy such deficiencies of Khojasteh et al. In particular, Brock reports single-resin compositions. See, for instance, Brock et al. at column 8, lines 54-60.

Thus, the rejection can not be sustained. This is mandated by Section 2143.03 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, which states in part:

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Barclay et al  
U.S.S.N. 10/718,487  
Page 8

Claims 54 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Sinta et al. (US Patent 5886102).

While Applicants disagree with the rejection, claims 54 and 61 have been cancelled without prejudice. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)  
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
Telephone: 617 439 4444